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## PREFACE

On learning that the Euthyphro had been substituted for the Apology in Responsions at Oxford, I was glad to avail myself of the permission of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to return to my old pastures in Plato. This book is intended as a companion volume to my edition of the Crito. It will be read by the same class of students, 'who have grammar behind them' (if the schools have done their work) 'and philosophy before'. They need not trouble themselves with the critical apparatus, which is only there because the text has been taken over by arrangement from the Oxford Plato edited by Professor Burnet.

I have to thank Professor Walter Scott for his kindness in undertaking to look at the proofs.

13 Barnsley Road, Edgbaston
Birmingham.
Jan. 8, 1909.
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## INTRODUCTION

## 1. Possible origin of the Euthyphro.

We know from Xenophon (Mem. iv. 6, §§ 2-4) that Socrates had a talk with Euthydemus-his young disciple, not the sophist of that name-on the subject of piety. The writer's object in recording it is to show how Socrates improved his companions in dialectic, and the outcome of the conversation is the following definition: 'He who knows how to honour the gods in the way established by law will rightly be defined by us as pious.' ${ }^{1}$ It does not then seem any great stretch of imagination to suppose that this actual talk on the part of Socrates has been glorified by Plato into the dialogue of the Euthyphro. The Euthyphro, like the conversation in Xenophon, is intended as an exercise in logic, though it is more besides. It has the same apologetic aim as the Apology itself and the Crito. The time and place are carefully selected for dramatic effect, with a view to drawing attention to the indictment against Socrates for impiety and at the same time showing that the real impiety lay in the old beliefs, which Socrates was doing his best to get rid of. With the same controversial object Plato introduces, in place of Euthydemus the disciple, a possibly historical, but also, we must remember, possibly wholly fictitious character called Euthyphro, who is regarded, by himself at least, as the greatest living authority on the subject of piety. Since the days of Homer, and doubtless

[^0]for long before that, the office of seer ( $\mu$ ávtıs) had been one of the most respectable of professions, though it was beginning to lose its sanctity in a rationalistic age. The change of person in the dialogue is just what might have been expected from the literary sense, not to say the slight malice, of Plato, who likes to season his dialogues with the exposure of pomposity and pretentiousness. So we have a Euthyphro instead of a Euthydemus Minor.
2. Euthyphro the seer not the same as Euthyphro the philologist.
In the Cratylus there are frequent references ${ }^{1}$ to a certain Euthyphro, who when first mentioned is called the Prospaltian, and who seems not only to have been a great philologist himself, but to have had also a following in philology. ${ }^{2}$ Socrates pretends that it is from contact with him that he has caught what we may call his 'verbal inspiration', and the Cratylus may very well be intended to some extent as a burlesque on the methods of etymology adopted by this philologian. There does not however seem to be anything common to him and our seer, except the name. If our Euthyphro had been famous for his derivations, is it likely that Plato would have omitted all reference to this fact?

## 3. Euthyphro not a type of the Athenian people.

There is an idea as old as Numenius, ${ }^{3}$ which has been reaffirmed more recently, ${ }^{4}$ that under the person of Eu-
${ }^{1} 396$ d, $399 \mathrm{a}, 400 \mathrm{a}, 407 \mathrm{e}, 409 \mathrm{~d}, 428 \mathrm{e}$.
${ }^{2}$ Toîs ả $\mu \phi i$ Eú $\dot{v} \dot{\phi} p o v a$ however in 400 a need not imply more than himself. The Greeks often spoke thus of an individual, as we magnify a man into a 'school'.

 коа́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu$ о .
${ }^{4}$ Mr. Wells, Introd. p. II says: 'To explain this apparently outrageous conception, we must suggest that Plato has taken Enthyphro as a type of the Athenians themselves, and is attempting
thyphro Plato symbolized the Athenian people. What there is of truth in this view has been hit off by Mr. Adam when he says (Introd. p. xxiv): 'Euthyphro is the incarnation of Plato's view of Athenian orthodoxy carried out consistently into practice.' The suggestion of Numenius does not bear thinking out. For the Athenian people is as unfriendly to Euthyphro as it is to Socrates, though in a different way. It derides his prophecies ( 3 c 1) and condemns his conduct in prosecuting his father ( 6 a 3 ). On the other hand Euthyphro is friendly to Socrates, regarding him with sympathy as an unappreciated brother. What Euthyphro really is, or represents, is the divine of the period, whose morality was behind the times because he conscientiously believed and was ready to act upon what they only professed to believe and set aside in practice. Euthyphro is conceited, but he is quite sincere. He thinks himself possessed of a knowledge about divine matters which is denied to the vulgar (3c), but which is of vital importance to the welfare of the state ( 14 b ). Through him Plato lets the Athenian people see how little the religion, which they were ready to uphold as against Socrates, affected their own practice, and how little it was to be desired that it should do so. But Euthyphro is below the moral standard of his age, as Socrates is above it. The Athenian penple lies between the two. It finds its representative in Meletus, who was so concerned about the evil influence of Socrates upon the young.

## 4. Coincidence betwien Xenophon and the zeorks of Plato.

It is a curious coincidence, but it is probably nothing more, that the first instance which Xenophon selects to illustrate Socrates' method of arriving at a definition should be that of piety, and that it should be a dialogue on the same subject which comes first in the traditional arrangement of Plato's works.
to put before the Athenians their own inconsistency, and has donned for the nonce the comic mask of Aristophanes.'

## 5. Reason why the Euthyphro heads the list.

The fact that the Euthyphro stands first among the Platonic dialogues affords no clue to the date of its composition. It owes its position to its forming part of a tetralogy ${ }^{1}$ dealing with the trial and death of Socrates. It comes first in this quartette because its dramatic date is first. We here find Socrates before his actual trial putting in his appearance at the court of the King Archon. In the Apology we hear him defending himself before his judges. In the Crito we find him refusing to evade the law by availing himself of an escape from prison which had been provided for him. In the Phaedo we listen to his last discourse before drinking the hemlock. That is certainly the natural order in which to read these four dialogues, whatever may have been the order in which they were written. But the biographical principle of arrangement might have been carried further. At the end of the Theaetetus Socrates says: 'Now I must be off to the King's Porch, to meet the indictment of Meletus, which he has brought against me.' The dramatic date therefore of that dialogue is immediately before that of the Euthyphro. And again the Meno foreshadows the coming trouble in its hint of the offence given to Anytus and its record of his threat of vengeance ( $94 \mathrm{e}, 95 \mathrm{a}, 100 \mathrm{c}$ ), so that the dramatic date of the Meno is again anterior to that of the Theaetetus. But instead of the biographical principle being extended to these dialogues the Theaetetus has, judiciously no doubt, been thrown in with what are commonly known as the logical dialogues (Cratylus, Sophistes, Politicus), while the Meno has been conjoined with the Euthydemus, Protagoras, and Gorgias, which have to do with the Sophists.

> 6. Result of stylometry.

But while we cannot argue in any way from the place of the Euthyphro among the dialogues to its date of composi-

[^1]tion, we are met by another curious coincidence. For the modern science of stylometry, as inaugurated by the learned and patient Pole, Wincenty Lutoslawski, brings out the Euthyphro as the earliest of Plato's works, except the Apology. ${ }^{1}$ Next to it comes the Crito.

## 7. The Euthyphro a good introduction to the Dialogues.

Whatever the date of the Euthyphro may be, it is one of the easiest of all the dialogues, and at the same time sufficiently representative to serve as a good introduction to the rest. These considerations may have influenced Thrasyllus, or whoever was the arranger of the tetralogies, in putting it first. The student who has read it will have a good idea of how Socrates went about fulfilling what he believed to be his divine mission of convincing, or at least convicting, the world of ignorance. On the very threshold of the tribunal before which his persistence in this conduct had at last landed him, he exposes the ignorance of one who thought himself a great authority on divine matters.

## 8. Simplicity of structure.

As regards the persons the dialogue has all the simplicity of the earlier Aeschylean tragedy in which there were only two actors. In the Euthyphro, as in the Crito, the Ion and and other dialogues, there are only two interlocutors from first to last. In the Meno on the other hand the page-boy and Anytus take part in the conversation, and there is some suggestion of an audience in the background ( $82 \mathrm{~b}, 89 \mathrm{e}$ ).
${ }^{1}$ Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic, p. 162. More in detail Lutoslawski declares that 'the Euthyphro is earlier than the Symposium' (p. 159), and that it 'precedes the Meno and Gorgias on grounds of style, composition, and contents' (p. 200). 'It contains many peculiarities of earlier style: $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ used always instead

 the genitive prevailing over all other prepositions, \&c.'-Note on p. 200.

But in the Euthyphro, for aught that appears, Socrates and the seer had the King's Cloister all to themselves, until the latter discovered that he had business elsewhere.

## 9. The two kinds of dialogue.

There are two kinds of dialogue, the dramatic and the narrated. The former kind is preferred by Plato, the latter by Cicero. Among Plato's dialogues the Phaedo, Parmenides, Symposium, Anterastae, Charmides, Lysis, Euthydemus, Protagoras, and Republic are narrated; the rest are dramatic. In the Theaetetus ( 143 c) Plato himself declares in favour of the dramatic form as saving trouble. On this ground the Euthyphro has been put by Teichmüller later even than the Theaetetus. ${ }^{1}$ Plato undoubtedly did prefer the dramatic form in his old age. But it is hazardous to assume that he never used it earlier than the Theaetetus.

## 10. Comparison with the Meno.

The Meno is a deeper dialogue than the Euthyphro, but there is a close resemblance between the two. Both are 'peirastic' or tentative dialogues, leading to no fixed conclusion. Both are intended as exercises in logic, and especially in the art of defining. In the Euthyphro a divine is exposed who is confident that he knows all about religion, in the Meno a disciple of the Sophists who is confident that he knows all about virtue. In both the interlocutor makes a false start when asked to define his subject, Euthyphro giving an example instead of a definition, while Meno in place of one general definition gives a string of particular ones. In both there is an interlude in the middle in which the gravity of the discussion is relieved by pleasantry, in the Euthyphro about the statues of Daedalus and in the Meno about the torpedo-fish. The statues of Daedalus are also referred to in the Meno at a later stage. The parallel-

[^2]ism might be carried further, if there were sufficient reason for doing so. But there are certain standing features of Plato's mind and style, which would render it possible to find many resemblances between any two of his works; so that, if likeness were taken as an indication of nearness in time, the argument might prove misleading.

## Ir. Logical ideas in the Euthyphro.

Coming now to the logical ideas contained in the Euthyphro, we may notice that we find here for the first time (assuming the early date of this dialogue) the important distinction between essence (ovoia) and accident, or, as it is here called, ' affection' ( $\pi \dot{d} \theta$ os 11 a 8). Also the logical relation of Species and Genus is elaborated, and the Aristotelian formula for expressing this relation is anticipated, where Socrates suggests to Euthyphro that 'the holy is always just, but the just not always holy' (I2 a I). With a view to his grasping this relation Euthyphro is given a little lesson in the conversion of propositions ( $12 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{d}$ ). The term 'part' ${ }^{1}$ here begins to be used in a technical sense for 'species', which is a part in extension. In this dialogue, as indeed everywhere, except in the Timaeus, much use is made of the Socratic induction ( 13 d, e, 14 a). Above all, strict definition by genus and difference is insisted on (12 d6). As in the Meno, a satisfactory definition drawn from mathematics is produced by Socrates for the benefit of his collocutor. In the Euthydemus the example chosen is that of an even number ( $12 \mathrm{~d} 9,10$ ), in the Meno that of figure ( 76 a ). Here, too, as in the Meno, the doctrine of ideas appears in an unobjectionable form. It is assumed that in things which go under the same name, such as 'holy', there is something common, in virtue of which they are called by that name. This common character is their form ( $\epsilon \hat{i} \delta o s$ or $i \delta^{\circ} \epsilon \in 5 \mathrm{~d} 4$ ), and to seize upon it is to give their definition ( $6 \mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{e}$ ). Though
${ }^{1}$ بópıov 12 c , $\mathrm{d}: \mu$ f́pos 12 d , e. Cicero regularly uses pars in this sense ir his De Inventione.
the word 'pattern' ( $\pi a \rho a \dot{\delta} \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a)$ is not used in the Meno in this connexion, yet the substance of what is expressed by it is. ${ }^{1}$ In both dialogues Plato's Idealism, that is, his Realism, is at the same stage. The ideas are immanent, but are not yet transcendent.

One more logical point may be noticed before we quit the subject, and that is the employment of the Argumentum ad Hominem. Properly understood, this is like bringing down a bird with an arrow fledged from its own wing. Euthyphro's definition of the holy as 'what is dear to the Gods' is upset on his own view, which is not shared by Socrates, that the Gods may differ among themselves.

## 12. Outcome of the dialogue for the Greeks.

Thus the dialogue, while it affords all this logical exercise, may be considered to justify its existence, in spite of its negative result. But if any one craves some positive conclusion, let him look at what Socrates himself contributes to the discussion. After the interlude, when they go to work again, Socrates volunteers to supply the genus of holiness, leaving it to Euthyphro to add the difference ( 12 d 6 ). In referring the holy to the general head of the just, Socrates is practically defining 'piety' as 'justice towards the Gods', a conception which reappears in later Greek thought. Moreover, the view of holiness which regards it as having to do with ' attendance on the Gods' ( $12 \mathrm{e} 6 \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon p a \pi \epsilon i a \nu$ ) fixed itself in the mind of the Greeks, as also did the erroneous conception of piety as a form of knowledge (14C5). We find these two elements blended in the Stoic definition of piety as 'knowing how to attend upon Gods'. (See note on 15 a 5).

## 13. Outcome for ourselves.

To read Plato is like skating. We skim lightly over a smooth surface which may conceal hidden depths. Let us
${ }^{1}$ Cp. Euthph. 6 e 4 with Meno 72 c 8-10, and see note on Euthph. 6 e 4.
therefore ask before we conclude whether the dialogue contains anything that is less local and temporary, any word which may still be of service to ourselves. The conception of piety as a kind of trade between men and Gods, which is foisted upon Euthyphro, is not one which can yet be regarded as quite obsolete. But that is something to avoid rather than something to take home to ourselves. The passage which is likely to imprint itself upon the mind of this generation is the one in which it is hinted that piety may consist in our being workers under God towards the production of some glorious effect (I3e Io, II). But what that effect is Euthyphro cannot tell and Socrates does not pretend to know. 'Many fine ones' is all that Euthyphro can say. But in what the service for each consists, that we have to discover (or invent) for ourselves. 'Let each man be fully assured in his own mind.'

## COURSE OF THE DIALOGUE

## Introduction (2 a-5 c 8).

For so short a dialogue the Euthyphro has a rather long Introduction.
Socrates and Euthyphro meet in the colonnade of the King Archon, who tried cases connected with religion, and before whom they both have business. The first part of the Introduction sets before us the case of Socrates ( $2 \mathrm{a}-3 \mathrm{e} 6$ ), the second that of Euthyphro (3e7-5 c 8). As a result of their conversation Socrates has to come to the conclusion that he had better be taught piety by Euthyphro, who must know more about it than the vulgar, else he would not be prosecuting his old father for murder.

## False start on the part of Euthyphro (5c8-6c 9).

Accordingly he begs Euthyphro to define the holy.
(I) The holy is what I am doing now-says Euthyphro, appealing to the example of the Gods in confirmation of his statement. Socrates suspects that his own reluctance to accept the tales about the Gods may have something to do with his prosecution. But if so great an authority as Euthyphro really believes in the tales of quarrels among the Gods, he supposes he will have to give in, for he himself does not claim any knowledge on the subject. Euthyphro not only believes these tales, but could tell Socrates others which would astonish him. Socrates would like to hear them another time, when they are more at leisure.

$$
\text { First definition of the holy (6 с 9-7 a } 1 \text { ). }
$$

Meantime he would like a little more precise information about the holy. What Euthyphro has done is to give him an example of the holy instead of a definition. In all acts
that are holy there must be some one form (ióéa) which makes them holy. Let Euthyphro state what this is, and then Socrates will be able to use this statement as a pattern ( $\pi a \rho \alpha \delta^{\delta} \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a$ ) whereby to judge whether any particular piece of conduct deserves the name of 'holy' or not.

Euthyphro now rises to the occasion and gives the following definition:-
(2) The holy is that which is clear to the Gods.

$$
\text { Refutation of this Definition (7 a } 2-8 \text { b 6). }
$$

But the Gods (it is maintained) quarrel among themselves. And when men or Gods quarrel, it is always about questions of right and wrong.

And what people think right they love, and what they think wrong they hate.
$\therefore$ The same things will be both loved and hated by the Gods.
$\therefore$ The same things are both holy and unholy.
It follows that Euthyphro's conduct may be loved by one God but hated by another, so that it may be at once holy and unholy.

## Defence of his Definition by Euthyphro (8 b 7-9 b 3).

Euthyphro now expresses his conviction that all the Gods are agreed that one who has put another to death unjustly ought to be punished. In reply to this Socrates points out that what is universally agreed upon is only that, if injustice has been done, it ought to be punished. The point in dispute is always whether injustice has been done. What convincing proof has Euthyphro to offer that all Gods are agreed about the merits of so doubtful a case as that of his father? If he can adduce this, Socrates will rever cease to extol his wisdom.

## Amendment of the Definition (9 b 4-e 3).

Presently it occurs to So crates that, even if Euthyphro could do this, it would not justify the definition of the holy.

It would show indeed that some particular act was, as a matter of fact, God-hated. But the definition admits of anything which is God-hated being also conceivably God-loved. Accordingly Socrates now suggests an amendment which Euthyphro accepts:-
(3) The holy is that which is loved by all the Gods.

$$
\text { Refutation of this Definition ( } 9 \text { e 4-11 b 5). }
$$

Is the holy, asks Socrates, loved because it is holy? Or is it holy because it is loved ?

Euthyphro has difficulty in understanding this question, a difficulty which Socrates tries to remove by a grammatical disquisition on the difference between active and passive, the upshot of which is to show that the loved is made so by being loved. After this Euthyphro decides that the holy is loved because it is holy. Socrates has now entangled him in a syllogism in the second figure which proves the distinctness of the holy from the God-loved. This syllogism may be put thus:-

The God-loved is made what it is by being loved by the Gods.

The holy is not made what it is by being loved by the Gods.
$\therefore$ The holy is not the God-loved.
The holy may be God-loved, even to the extent of being loved by all the Gods, but, if so, that is an accident ( $\pi$ ioos) of the holy, and not the essence (núvia).

## Interlude ( I b 9-e r).

Euthyphro now complains of how his statements seem to run about, and there is a short interlude, during which there is some pleasantry about the statues of Daedalus, which were supposed not to stay where they were put.

## The Discussion Resumed (I I e I-I 2 e 8).

Socrates himself now makes a contribution towards the definition-The holy is always just.

Is the just, he goes on to ask, always holy? Euthyphro again does not follow. So the meaning is illustrated for him by a quotation. When the poet says, 'Where fear is, there is also shame,' Socrates does not agree with him, but would convert the proposition and say, ' Where shame is, there is also fear.' For 'fear' ' is the wider of the two terms. Which then is the wider of the two terms 'holy' and 'just'? Euthyphro agrees that the holy is part of the just. It remains then, says Socrates, to determine what part, i. e. to give the difference of the holy from the rest of the just. The requirements of a logical definition are illustrated for Euthyphro's benefit by a mathematical example-'An even number is one which is divisible into two equal parts.' Once again Euthyphro rises to the occasion and gives the following definition-
(4) The holy is that part of the just which has to do with attendance on the Gods.

## Objection to this Definition ( 12 e $9-13$ d 3).

Socrates praises this definition, but he has a little difficulty about the word 'attendance'. It is shown by a Socratic induction that attendance on a thing is with a view to making it better. Of course Euthyphro would not admit that, when he does anything holy, he is making some of the Gods better. What kind of attendance then is meant in this case ? 'That of servants on their masters,' is the reply. So the definition now assumes the form-
(5) Holiness is a kind of service to the Gods.

## Discussion of this Definition ( $13 \mathrm{~d} 9-14 \mathrm{C} 7$ ).

Again by a Socratic induction it is shown that service to anyone contributes towards the production of some efiect. What then is that glorious effect towards which our servise to the Gods contributes? 'Many fine ones,' answers Euthyphro. But can they not be summed up under one head, just as we say of a general that he produces victory in
war, and of a farmer that he produces food from the ground? Euthyphro declares that it would take him too long to explain this fully to Socrates, but in general he is prepared to say that 'if one knows how to say and do what is grateful to the Gods in praying and sacrificing, that is what is holy, and it is conduct of this kind that leads to the salvation of private houses and commonwealths, whereas the opposite of the grateful is impious, and this is what upsets and destroys everything.'
This pronouncement is condensed by Socrates, with the approval of Euthyphro, into-
(6) Holiness is some knowledge about sacrificing and praying.

## Interpretation of this Definition ( 14 c 8-d 6).

To sacrifice is to present gifts to the Gods, and to pray is to ask something from them. It follows that we may formulate the definition thus-
(7) Holiness is a science of asking from and giving to Gods.

$$
\text { Further Interpretation ( } 14 \mathrm{~d} 6-\mathrm{e} 7 \text { ). }
$$

But to ask aright is to ask what we need, and to give aright is to give what they need. Hence it results that-
(8) Holiness is an art of trading between Gods and men.

## Reversion to the original Definition (14 e 8-15 b 6).

Euthyphro is slightly suspicious of the word 'trading', and Socrates himself points out that we appear to get all the benefits of the commerce. What gifts, he asks, can we offer to the Gods? To which Euthyphro replies, 'Honour and gratitude.' Socrates seizes upon this last word, and asks Euthyphro whether he will allow that the holy is grateful, but not beneficial nor dear to the Gods. Euthyphro, who has been convinced against his will, thinks that it is above all things dear. So we come back to the original position-
(9) The holy is what is dear to the Gods.

## Conclusion ( I 5 b 7 -end).

Socrates now compliments Euthyphro on his being even a greater artist than Daedalus. Daedalus made his works walk about ; Euthyphro makes his revolve in a circle. We have come back to the point from which we started. The whole discussion then must be begun over again. Euthyphro is a Proteus who must be forced to reveal what he knows about the holy. For know it he must, else he never would have dared to act as he is doing. 'Tell me, then, my good Euthyphro, and do not hide from me what you deem it to be.' 'Another time,' says Euthyphro, Ieaving Socrates to bemoan his disappointed hopes of enlightenment.

## NOTE ON THE APPARATUS CRITICUS

The text of the Euthyphro depends mainly upon two manuscripts: the great Codex Clarkianus (B), written A.D. 895, and now in the Bodleian Library, and a manuscript of later date (Venetus T) which Schanz proved to be independent of $B$. It has lately been recognized that a Vienna MS. (Vindobonensis W) is of great importance. Almost all the other MSS. can be shown to be derived, directly or indirectly, from one or other of these three.
Valuable evidence can sometimes be found in quotations which occur in various ancient writers, notably Stobaeus, who compiled an anthology (Florilegium), and Eusebius, the Church Historian.
These names, or the letters which stand for them, will be found in the notes at the foot of the page.
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及o入a тà тolav̂тa $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o u ́ s . ~ к a i ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \mu o v ̂ ~ \gamma a ́ p ~ \tau o l, ~$



[^4]
 $\phi \rho о \nu \tau i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu, a ̉ \lambda \lambda$ ’ о́ $\mu o ́ \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$ lє́val.




 єітє $\delta \iota$ ' ä入入о т८.
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Eऽ $\Theta . \Delta \iota \propto$.
$\Sigma \Omega$. Tiva;

$\Sigma \Omega$. Тí ठє́; $\pi \epsilon \tau о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o ́ v ~ \tau \iota \nu a ~ \delta \iota \omega ́ к є \iota ร ; ~$
 $\mu a ́ \lambda a \pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v ́ \tau \eta s$.

[^5]$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Tís ovitos；
E〒e．＇O ধ́ $\mu$ òs $\pi a \tau \eta \dot{\rho} \rho$ ．
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．＇O नós，今̂ $\beta$ é $\lambda \tau \iota \tau \tau ;$
Eヘe．Пávv $\mu$ èv ov̂v．

г Eऽఆ．Фóvov，今ิ $\Sigma \omega ́ к \rho a t \epsilon s$ ．
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 каi $\eta \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota ~ € ̂ s ~ a ̉ v \delta \rho о ф о ́ v o v ~ к а i ̀ ~ o v ̉ o ̀ e ̀ v ~ o ̂ v ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a ~ \epsilon i ~ к a i ̀ ~ a ̀ \pi о-~$
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 үàp єival тò viòv $\pi a \tau \rho \grave{i}$ фóvov è $\pi \epsilon \xi \iota \in \in v a l-\kappa a \kappa \omega ̂ s ~ \epsilon i o ̀ o ́ t \epsilon s, ~$
 àvóiov.



 $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a ~ \tau v \gamma \chi a ́ v \eta ̨ s ~ \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega v ;$

 5

 $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \hat{\varphi} \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a l$, кaì $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \gamma \rho a \phi \eta ̂ s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ M \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \tau о \nu$










 eg ă T: om. B $\mu о \nu$ Heusde : $\mu_{\iota} \mathrm{BT}$ a $7 \phi \eta_{\iota} \mathrm{B}:$ om. T






 خे $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\iota}$ दे $\mu \hat{v}$.



廿ato. vîv ô̂v $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \Delta i o ̀ s ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon ~ \mu o l ~ o ̂ ̀ ~ v v v o ̀ \eta ̀ ~ \sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} s ~ \epsilon i o ̂ ́ c ́ v a l ~$




 5 àvórıov eival;
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 тà Є̀vavtía $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \sigma v \sigma \iota ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ́ ~ \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} v$ каì $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \epsilon ่ \mu о \hat{v}$.








 oi $\pi$ о入入oì ov̉k $\iota \sigma \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$ ．
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda \eta ́ \lambda о v s, ~ к а i ̀ ~ \epsilon ้ \chi \theta \rho a s ~ \gamma \epsilon ~ \delta \epsilon \iota \nu a ̀ s ~ к а i ~ \mu a ́ \chi a s ~ к а i ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda a ~$

 ठ̀クे каi тоîs $\mu \epsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda o \iota s ~ П a v a \theta \eta v a i ́ o \iota s ~ o ́ ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda o s ~ \mu \epsilon \sigma \tau o ̀ s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~$





$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Оv̉k àv $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta o \iota \mu \iota$ ．à $\lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau a ~ \mu \epsilon ́ v ~ \mu o \iota ~ \in i s ~ a v ̂ \theta \iota s ~$
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 фท̀s єival ö $\sigma \iota$ ．

Eగఆ．Kaì үà ${ }^{\text {Ë } \sigma \tau \iota v . ~}$




Eऽఆ．＂E $\gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$ ．




 $\phi \rho a ́ \sigma \omega$ ．
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．＇A入入à $\mu \grave{v} v$ ßov́ло ${ }^{\prime}$ í $\gamma \epsilon$ ．






E〒e．Пávv $\mu \in ิ v$ ov̂v．
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Фє́pє $\delta \dot{\eta}$ ，̇̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \kappa \epsilon \psi \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ тí $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．тò $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \quad \theta \in o-$




$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Kai є̂̂ $\gamma \epsilon$ фаívєтaı єip $\bar{\sigma} \sigma a \iota ;$

d 3 就 om．pr．W d $7 \ddot{\partial} \sigma \iota \alpha$ post d 8 首 $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ transp．B a $3 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$ s
 p $\eta \tau a, \gamma$ á $\rho$ secl．Naber








 а̇тал入аүєіि $\mu \nu$ ；

ENe．Пávv $\gamma \epsilon$ ．

 $\tau \hat{\jmath}$ òraфopâs；

E欠e．＂Eбтı тav̂тa．



Eヘఆ．Пढ̂s $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ oṽ；



 ка入òv каi aïбрòv каì à $\gamma$ аӨòv каì какóv．ảpa оv таи̂тá



 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau о и ́ т \omega v . ~}$



 B ：$\tau \in \mathrm{T} \quad \bar{\eta} \mu \in \nu \mathrm{B}: \epsilon \ddot{\eta} \eta \mu \in \nu \mathrm{T} \quad \mathrm{d}_{4} \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho o l$ B T：$\chi \chi \theta \rho o i ́ ~ \gamma \in \mathrm{~W}$ $\mathrm{d} 9 \delta_{i}{ }^{\prime} \alpha u ̀ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \alpha i ̂ \tau \alpha ~ \mathrm{~T}: \delta i \alpha ̀ \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \mathrm{~B}: \delta i \grave{\alpha} \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \mathrm{~W}$






Eヘ $\Theta$ ．＇O $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s{ }^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon s$ ．



E欠ఆ．Пávv $\gamma \epsilon$ ．

 $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu 0 \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda \eta \eta_{\lambda o \iota}{ }^{\prime}$ âpa ov̉X oṽт $\omega$ ；

E「 $\Theta$ ．Oข̃тш．



Eऽe．＂Eoıкєv．
 $\phi \rho \omega \nu$, тои́т $\varphi$ т $̂$ ̂ $\lambda о ́ \gamma \varphi$ ．

E「ఆ．Kıvòvvєv́єı．







 tà avirá．
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 á $^{\rho}$;

EヘE. 'A ${ }^{\prime} \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \epsilon s$.




$\Sigma \Omega$. Oủkô̂v aưtá $\gamma \epsilon$ таv̂та каì oi $\theta \epsilon o i ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \pi o ́ v \theta a \sigma \iota \nu$,




 кєф́́入аıov.



 àòíк $\omega s^{*}$ â $\rho^{\prime}$ oủX oṽт $\omega$;

 $\mathrm{B}^{2}$ Arm. : om. T (in B W plurima desunt) d 8 àj $\alpha^{\prime} \mathrm{B}$ : $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \dot{1}$ $\mathrm{B}^{2} \mathrm{~T}$ d $9 \pi \in \rho i \mathrm{~B}: \tau \in \pi \in \rho i \mathrm{~T}$ e $2 \gamma \in \mathrm{~T}$ : om, B : post $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \in \epsilon \in \mathrm{W}$


## Eヘe. Пávv үє.















 द̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ кaì oi $\theta \epsilon o i ̀ ~ a ̈ \pi a \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o l a v ̂ \tau a ~ \mu \iota \sigma o v ̂ \sigma \iota \nu . ~$
 $10 \mu 0 v \lambda$ र́́ $o v \tau o s$.
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 $\mu \imath \sigma \omega ิ \sigma v$, àvóvtov．




 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．




$\Sigma \Omega$ ．＇Ал入’＇̇ү⿳亠 $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ \sigma о \mu а \iota ~ \sigma а ф \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu ~ ф \rho a ́ \sigma а \iota . ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma о-~ 5 ~$




 тò фし入ov̂v；

Ěe．Пढ̂s $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ov̌；



EヘE．Oṽк，à入入à ס̀ıà тov̂тo．
 סьóтı о́ $\rho a ̂ t a l ;$

## E〒e．Пávv $\gamma \epsilon$ ．











 $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi$ रv $\tau \iota$ vinó $\tau o v ;$

E〒e．Пávv $\gamma \epsilon$ ．

 фıлєîtal фıлoúuєvov；




Ere．Naí．

5 Ere．Oṽк，ả入入à ס̀à тov̂тo．
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．$\Delta$ เóть ă $\rho a \quad$ ö $\sigma \iota o ́ v ~ \grave{~} \sigma \tau \tau \iota \nu ~ \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon i ̂ t a i, ~ a ̀ ~ a \lambda ’ ~ o u ̉ \chi ~ o ̃ ̃ \tau \iota ~$


EヘE．＂Eоıкย．



Eヘe．Пఱ̂s $\gamma$ àp oṽ；


 öт $\mathrm{B} \mathrm{T} \mathrm{Arm}$.
d io $\tau \delta$ өєоф८лє́s add．Bast




E〒 $\Theta$ ．Naí．




Eऽఆ．＇А ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota s$.













 $\delta \iota \iota \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a-a ̉ \lambda \lambda$＇$\epsilon i \pi \epsilon ̀ \pi \rho \circ \theta \dot{v} \mu \omega s$ тí $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ тó $\tau \epsilon$ õ $\sigma \iota \nu \nu$ каi тò àvó⿱⺌兀ov；
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 àv $\tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$ oũt $\omega s$.






e $\Delta a \iota o ̂ a ́ \lambda o v ~ \sigma o ф i ́ a ~ \tau a ̀ ~ T a v \tau a ́ \lambda o v ~ \chi \rho \eta ́ \mu a \tau a ~ \gamma \in \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a l . ~ к а i ~ \tau o v ́-~$



5 ठокє̂̂ ठíкalov єival $\pi a ̂ \nu$ тò öб七ov.


 öَ $\sigma \circ v, \tau o ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon ́ ~ \tau \iota ~ к а i ̀ ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda о ; ~$
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Е〒ఆ．Пávv $\gamma є$.





Е〒ఆ．Пázv $\gamma є$ ．

 тє каi $\delta \epsilon ́ \delta o \iota к \epsilon \nu ~ a ̈ \mu а ~ \delta o ́ \xi а \nu ~ \pi о \nu \eta \rho i ́ a s ; ~$



 $\mu o ́ \rho t o v ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ a i o ̀ ̀ s ~ \delta \epsilon ́ o v s ~ \tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ả $\rho \iota \theta \mu$ о̂́ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau o ́ v, ~ \check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ov̉X



Е〒ఆ．Пávv $\gamma \epsilon$ ．

 ìva סè סíkalov oủ $\pi a \nu \tau a \chi o v ̂ ~ o ̈ \sigma \iota o v ~ \mu o ́ p ı o v ~ \gamma a ̀ ~ \rho ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ \delta ı k a i ́ o v ~$









 aidoûs סéos T

тv








 то̂̂ ठıкаíov $\mu$ є́ pos．






Е〒ఆ．Пávv $\gamma \epsilon$ ．

Eヶ丹．Naí．
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Ov̉ס́́ $\gamma \epsilon$ кv́vas $\pi a ̂ s ~ \grave{\epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a t a \iota ~} \theta \epsilon \rho a \pi \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \iota v$ à̀入à ó 10 кขขך $\gamma \in \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s$.

E〒e．Ov゙т

b E〒 $\Theta$ ．Naí．

Е〒ఆ．Пávv $\gamma \in$ ．
 5 фр $\omega \nu$ ；ov゙т $\omega$ 入є́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota$ ；

E〒 $\Theta$ ．＂${ }^{*} \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$.



$$
\mathrm{b}=\gamma \in \mathrm{T}: \text { om. } \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{~b} 8 \underset{\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota}{ } \mathrm{~B}: \epsilon \sigma \tau a l \mathrm{~T}
$$


 боь；





E〒ఆ．Мà $\Delta \imath^{\prime}$ о оикк є้ $\gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$ ．
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．＇А $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ є $\pi^{\prime}$＇$\omega \phi \in \lambda i ́ a ;$
Е〒ఆ．Пفिs $\delta^{\prime}$ ov้；
 тє́ $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota ~ \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ каi $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i ́ o v s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon o u ̀ s ~ \pi o \iota \epsilon i ̂ ; ~ к а i ̀ ~ \sigma u ̀ ~ \tau о и ̂ \tau о ~$
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \omega ิ \nu$ ả $\pi \epsilon \rho \gamma a ́ S_{\imath} \eta ;$

E〒e．Мà $\Delta \hat{\imath}^{\prime}$ ои̉к є＇$\gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$ ．


 тоєаúт $\eta \nu \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \in \iota \nu$ ．

$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Eî $\nu^{*}$ ảd入̀̀ тís $\delta \grave{\eta} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \rho a \pi \epsilon i ́ a ~ \epsilon i ̆ \eta ~ a ̀ \nu \nu ~ \grave{\eta}$ ó $\sigma \iota o ́ \tau \eta s ;$
 Aєратєúovбเv．

Е〒ఆ．Пávv $\mu \in ̀ v$ ov̉v．
 є́p o้้ย！；

## E〒e．＂E $\quad{ }^{\prime} \omega \gamma \epsilon$.

 àтє $\rho \gamma a \sigma i ́ a \nu$ vi $\pi \eta \rho \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ є่ $\sigma \tau เ \nu ;$
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$\Sigma \Omega$ ．Kai үà $\rho$ oi $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o i ́, ~ \widehat{\omega}$ фí $\epsilon^{\cdot}$ ả $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ő $\mu \omega s$ тò кєфá－入aıov av̉т $\hat{\nu} \nu$ คீ ả $\pi \epsilon \rho \gamma a ́ \zeta o v \tau a \iota^{\circ} \hat{\eta}$ ov้；

Е欠ఆ．Пิิs＇$\delta^{\prime}$ ov้；

 $\gamma \hat{\eta} s \tau \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime}$ ．

## Е〒ఆ．Пávv $\gamma є$ ．



E〒ఆ．Kaì ỏ入í





 à $\pi o ́ \lambda \lambda v \sigma \iota \nu$ ．




 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \alpha \sigma_{i} \alpha^{\prime}$ Schanz

 c 2 iка $\nu \bar{s}$ B：そows T


 тเขà то仑̂ $\theta \dot{v} \epsilon เ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к а i ̀ ~ \epsilon ข ้ \chi € \sigma \theta a \iota ; ~$

E〒ఆ．＂E $\gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$ ．
 $\epsilon ข ้ \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ait $\epsilon \hat{\nu}$ тоข̀s $\theta$ єov́s；
 10
$\Sigma \Omega$ ．＇Е $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta$ äpa air $\eta \sigma \epsilon \omega$ каi $\delta o ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ $\theta \epsilon o i ̂ s ~ o ́ \sigma เ o ́ \tau \eta s ~ d ~$







E〒 $\odot$ ．＂E $\gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon$ ．
 $\pi \alpha \rho ’$ Є̇кєív $\omega \nu$ ，тav̂ta av̉тoùs ait $\epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ；

Eヘఆ．＇А入入à $\tau$ ；





E〒e．＇А $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota s, \hat{\omega} \Sigma \omega ́ к р а т \epsilon s$.
5




 10
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 $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \omega \hat{\omega} a$ тоі̂ऽ $\theta \in o \iota ̂$ ；
 1о a้ $\rho \tau \iota$ є้ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma о \nu$ ；Хápıs；
 à $\lambda \lambda$＇oủxi＇${ }^{\prime} \phi \epsilon ́ \lambda l \mu o v ~ o v ̉ \delta e ̀ ~ \phi i ́ \lambda o v ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \theta \epsilon o i ̂ s ; ~$


5 Өєoîs фí入ov．
Е〒ఆ．Ма́ $\lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \gamma \epsilon$.

 $\Delta a i ̂ o a \lambda o v ~ \beta a \delta i ́ ̧ o v \tau a s ~ a u ̉ t o u ̀ s ~ \pi o t \epsilon i ̂ v, ~ a v ̉ \tau o ̀ s ~ e ̂ v ~ \pi o \lambda v ́ ~ \gamma \epsilon ~$



 ov $\mu$＇́ $\mu \nu \eta \sigma a \iota ;$

## 




Е〒ఆ．Пávv $\gamma є$ ．
 $\kappa а \lambda \hat{\omega} s, \nu ข ้ \nu$ оu่к $\dot{o} \rho \theta \hat{\omega} s \tau \iota \epsilon \epsilon \mu \in \theta a$ ．

[^15]
## E〕丹. "Еоєкєข.













 $\pi о \iota, ~ к а i ́ ~ \mu о \iota ~ \check{\rho p a ~ a ̀ \pi \iota є ́ v a \iota . ~}$





 $\sigma o i ́ \mu \eta \nu$.


## NOTES

2 a i vérefov］＇out of the common．＇Cp．vewrepi\}́tv used of innovations．
 outside the walls．It is mentioned also as a resort of Socrates at the beginning of the Euthydemus， 271 a ．It was here that Aristotle used to lecture as he walked up and down．Hence his followers became known as the Peripatetic school and were associated with the Lyceum．

סtarpußás ］The meaning hovers between＇mode of spending time＇ and＇place where time is spent＇．L．and S．here render＇haunts＇．Cp．
 ঠıarpıßás．
3 Baciléws］The＇king＇archon was the only survival at Athens of the heroic type of monarchy．Certain priestly functions were still left to the＇king＇．An indictment for impiety came under his jurisdiction， and it was he who brought a charge of murder before the Areopagus． His wife was called＇queen＇．Cp．the rex sacrificulus at Rome．

Baoi入éws $\sigma$ roáv］Spoken of elliptically in Charm． 153 a as $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ Baбi入ıкฑ̂s．At the end of the Theaetetus， 210 d ，Socrates excuses his departure on the ground that he has to meet his indictment at this

 From another such building，the $\sigma \tau o d$ тонкí $\eta$ ，where Zeno afterwards taught，the Stoic sect derived its name．
mpòs tòv $\left.\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda_{\text {éa }}\right]$＇before the king．＇The acc．because Socrates has to go before the king to meet the indictment．
 the word＇Athenians＇．But the force imparted by this little particle is as follows－＇Whatever other people who make less pretension to correctness of speaking may call it，the Athenians at any rate call it an indictment．＇The name $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta$ was applied in strict propriety to a charge of some offence against the state．A private suit was a dic $\eta$ ， though the latter name was often used more widely．

む Eüणúфpov］The voc．throughout our text is the same as the nom．，but as quoted by Eusebius it is $\mathfrak{\omega}$ Eủ $\theta \dot{v} \phi \rho o v$.
b 2 ékєîvó $\gamma \in$ кaтayv＇́coual］＇pay you so bad a compliment as to suppose．＇Kaтayıүv＇்бкєเข is often thus used of an unfavourable



## EUTHYPHRO

 бонаи． into upwards of hundred demes or parishes．A citizen was istered as belonging to that deme to which his family belonged in the time of Cleisthenes．He might change his abode，but not his deme．See Bury，Hist．of Greece，p． 212.

тєтavótpixa］＇lank－haired．＇Astrologers maintained that a man who was born under the sign of the Virgin was retavóg $\langle\xi$ ．The opposite of this word is où入óко $\mu$ s．The opposite of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \rho \cup \pi o s$ is $\sigma \iota \mu$ о́s， ＇snub－nosed．＇Sext．Emp．adv．M．I 267，V 95．To the personal description of Meletus in the text we may add the fact that he was a poet．See Apol． 23 e．
 repeated is regularly introduced by the indirect interrogative，since it is dependent on a verb of asking understood．Cp．Hipp．Ma． $29^{2} \mathrm{C}$
 662 a kaì $\pi \hat{\omega}$ ．．．；öппыs；So very often in Aristophanes，e．g．Ran． 198 тí пoıtîs；örı $\pi 0 t \omega$ ；Ach．594－5，959：Av．164，299，608，960，996，
 1233－4 moíous $\theta$ eoís；$\pi$ тoíotat ；
 тives］Supply єioív．
 ＇it may be that＇，is very common in Plato．Cp．Meno 71 a $\bar{\omega}$ छ́є́vє，
 think me a gifted person．＇
6 ápa日iav］á $\mu a \theta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ is that crass ignorance which mistakes itself for knowledge，as opposed to mere ärvoıa．See Apol． 29 b and cp ．Lysis 218 a，b：Soph． 229 c ：Alc．${ }^{1} 117$ d， 118 b：Laws 691 a，819a．

 so distinctly an auxiliary verb here as it is in other passages，e．g．

 ȧпофаขои́ $\mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}$ оs）．Plato，it would seem，uses it with a pres．or with a fut．prtcp．Other writers prefer the fut．，e．g．Hdt．vii． 49 解 $\chi \circ \mu a \iota$

 NíкарХоs ${ }^{\epsilon \prime} \rho \chi \in \tau \alpha \iota \phi a \nu \omega ิ \nu$ ．Other verbs of going are used similarly．

ékкa日aipel］As though Socrates were a weed or a caterpillar．

## NOTES. $\quad 2 b_{2}-3 \mathbf{c}_{2}$

6 Bou入oí $\mu \nu$ ďv] vellem equidem.
ojpp $\omega \delta \hat{\omega}$ ] A very strong word-'I am horribly afraid'. Symp.


áтexves ] 'simply,' 'absolutely.' An adverb of asseveration very common in Plato and colloquial Greek. It is to be distinguished from àté $\chi^{\nu}$ טus, 'unskilfully.'
 ginning of anything, since sacrifices were offered to Hestia before


 Flac. § I 3 ad fin. : Plut. Mor. 549 E $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ảф’ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i ́ a s ~ a ́ \rho \chi \chi o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota ~$ marpóas. The saying is treated of by Erasmus in his Adagia, Chil. L, Cent. vi, Prov. 83.
b i oṽt $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ ] i.e. without due explanation.
3
vouí̧ovтa] The word $\nu о \mu i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ is suggestive of $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \iota \sigma \mu a$, 'currency.' Socrates is represented as coining new gods, instead of letting the old ones pass.
 is kaıvoùs . . . vopí̧ovta. This is an instance of what Riddell called Binary Structure.

סัт $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \eta^{\prime}$ ] 'It is because.' So in 9 b : Rep. $332 \mathrm{a}, 402 \mathrm{e}, 568 \mathrm{e}$.
тò Saıpóviov] 'the supernatural something.' If we are to supply
 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i o \nu, \mathrm{c}$ тò $\epsilon i \omega \theta o ̀ s ~ \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \nu$. In Apol. 3I d the thing is left in the vagueness of the neuter, as here, ötı $\mu 0 \iota \theta \in i o ̂ ̀ v ~ t ı ~ к a i ̀ ~ \delta a \iota \mu o ́ v ı o v ~$ ri$\gamma \nu \in \tau a l$, but it is there explained that it was 'a sort of voice occurring, which, whenever it occurs, always diverts me from whatever I am about to do, though it never incites me'. Hence in Apol.

 ठaıцóviov.

кalvoтоцоиิvтos] Cp. 5 a, 16 a.
7 ©s $\delta t a \beta a \lambda \omega \bar{v}]$ 'with intent to misrepresent you.' Cp. Apol. I9 a $\tau \eta े \nu \delta \iota a \beta \circ \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$, which Riddell renders 'calumny believed ', i. e. 'preju--dice'. The essential nature of calumny comes out in our word 'devilish', to which Hebrew as well as Hellenic thought has contributed.

 $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ enas in Crito 45 e.

## EUTHYPHRO

## 3

 above that of the vulgar, which was just what Socrates disclaimed. See especially Ion $53^{2}$ d, e. 4 d ov̉ס̀̀v $\begin{gathered}\text { ôv } \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a . ~\end{gathered}$
סเסaбka入ıкóv] 'inclined to teach.' This is what Socrates was and what Euthyphro was not.
kai äl ${ }^{\prime} \lambda_{0} v_{s}$ ] This point is brought out in the Apology 19 b, where the supposed indictment brought by popular prejudice
 бьסáбкшข.
єǐr' oủv $\phi$ Óóvథ] 'whether indeed it be out of envy.'
$\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{fl}]$ The accent is thrown back because the prep. follows its case.
ov̉ $\pi$ ávv '̇ $\pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \hat{\omega}]$ 'I am not particularly desirous.' This is always the meaning of oủ mávv ( = Lat. non omnino), though it may often, as here, by an ironical meiosis imply 'not at all' (=omnino non).
5 Sokeîs $\sigma$ táviov $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'have a reputation for making yourself scarce,' or 'for reserve'.
7 фı $\lambda a v \theta \rho \omega \pi i a s]$ Xenophon (Mem. I. 2 § 60) claims this virtue for Socrates on the ground of his never teaching for pay. Prometheus, like Socrates, suffered for his $\phi \iota \lambda$ áv $\theta \rho \omega \pi m$ т $\tau$ ónos. If the dialectic of Socrates had been confined to himself, Athens would have endured him, but when sons began to use it on their fathers, 'the Church was in danger.'


$\pi \rho o \sigma \tau t \theta \epsilon i s$ âv $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{\omega s}$ ] 'being glad to pay.' We cannot put a participle into the conditional.
 both members are affirmative. Cp. Ioe, ira: Apol, zob: Hipp. Ma. 294 d . For $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$. . . $\epsilon i \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta$ gee 4 b note. There are several instances in which $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ following $\epsilon i \mu^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is elliptically equivalent to cí $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta$, e.g. Symp. 212 c: Alc. ${ }^{1} 114$ b: Euthd. 285 c.
10 vuvס向] $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ is 'now', but $\nu v v \delta \dot{\eta}, ~ ' j u s t ~ n o w . ' ~ C p . ~ 5 c . ~$
e 2 סtayayeiv] 'to spend one's time.' Hence $\delta t a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$, 'way of spending time.'

## NOTES. $\quad 3$ c $3-4$ b 10

$\left.\sigma \pi 0 \cup \delta d^{\sigma} \sigma v \tau a l\right]$ The indicative to express the likely contingency'but if they are going to be serious'.
3 víîv toîs $\mu$ úvтєđเv] 'seers like you.'
5 áycutn̂] A metaphor from the stadium. Cp. Apol. 34 c é $\lambda$ ártc
 sing. in $-\eta$ is now considered classical, not that in $-\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. Exceptions



$2 \pi \epsilon \tau$ ónevóv tiva] The Greek equivalent of our proverbial expression ' a wild-goose chase '.

סเшкets] The two meanings of this word, the physical and the legal, easily lend themselves to punning. Cp. Ar. Ach. 698 :


oos $\gamma \xi$ ] Giving a reason, like the Lat. quippe qui.



b i aúró] Used vaguely, like our 'it'. The meaning is 'to do what you are doing'. Cp. Apol. 2 I b: Meno 73 c : Tim. 50 a: Eur. Hec. 973.


© $\tau \in \theta v \in \omega \dot{s}]$ 'the man who has been killed.' $\theta \nu \eta \eta$ 'бкє $\nu$ is the virtual

 so on.

 of the 2nd pers. is regular in Attic in the impf. of lívau. Cp. $\hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a$, $\notin \varphi \eta \sigma \theta a, \eta \eta \delta \eta \sigma \theta a I_{5} \mathrm{~d}, \delta \iota \eta \eta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \mathrm{Tim} .26 \mathrm{c}$. In oî $\sigma \theta a$ we have it in a primary tense. In Homer it is found also in the conj. and opt. moods.

фu入ávтtเv] 'to observe.'
$\epsilon i \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \ldots \epsilon i \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta ́]$ For this particular combination of particles, which in Plato at least is not so common as might be supposed, cp. $5 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ : Phaedo 76 d , e : Ceb. Tab. line 39 (ed. Jerram). Equiva-
 єi $\delta \grave{\text { è }} \mu \eta$ ' Symp. $185 \mathrm{~d}, 212 \mathrm{~d}$ : Hipp. Ma. 295 b: Laws 63 I b, c (cp. Ceb. Tab. line 192, Po!yb. vi. 39 § 6 ) : éà̀ . . . $\epsilon i$ i $\delta \grave{\text { è }} \mu \eta$ Menex.
 $\delta \grave{~} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ Phaedo 116 d .
iv $\delta$ íkn] A phrase common in Plato, e.g. 6a: Phaedr. 226 a ,
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 next line seems to mean ' equal to that of the murderer'.
C 2 кai $\mu \eta$ d̀ dogtois] 'instead of purifying.'

' $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i}$ '] 'though.' The thought is as follows-' Not that in the present case the person killed was a stranger, since ' \&c. For this elliptical use of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i ́ c p .9 \mathrm{~b}$ : Apol. 19 e, 20 a.
$\pi \in \lambda a ́ \tau \eta s$ ] 'a dependant.' Only here in Plato. It is the word which was afterwards used to translate the Lat. cliens. por conduct of a $\pi$ apoívios àvíp ascribed to War by Aristophanes, Ach. $9^{81-7 .}$
 ả $\mu ф о т$ є́pous.
8 тov̂ ' $\xi \xi \eta \gamma \eta \tau 0 \hat{v}]$ 'the Interpreter.' Used in the pl. in 9 a. The word is frequent in the Laws, e.g. 87ı с $\nu о \mu о ф v ́ \lambda a \kappa \epsilon s ~ \mu \in \tau^{\prime} \in \xi \xi \gamma \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кaì $\mu a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \omega \nu$ кaì $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$. In Rep. 427 c the Delphian Apollo is
 of the earth at its navel.'
oitl xpei $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ moleiv] ' what was the proper thing to do.'
\%̈ $\pi \in \rho$ ouvv kai $\epsilon \in \pi a \theta \in v$ ] 'which was just what happened to him.'
5



 é $\nu \epsilon$ є́pas $\mu 0$, ' then that is why you were looking at me.'
9 oủ $\delta \in i$ iv ] The oủ here is a mere echo of the oữt above, and has no effect on the sense.
e 1 vóv] Supposed now to be the classical spelling for vióv.
 to face Meletus.' Cp. 15 e 7 .
5 $\lambda_{\text {'fovia] The Scholiast thinks it worth pointing out that this is }}$ not in the dat. to agree with $\mu$ o. But such a change to the acc. and inf. is quite common. Cp. Crito $51 \mathrm{~d} \lambda a \beta o ́ v \tau a:$ Alc. ${ }^{1}{ }^{1} 43$ e: Hipp.

b $2 \lambda \dot{\alpha} \chi \in \delta_{i k \eta v] ~ \lambda a \gamma \chi \alpha ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \delta i ́ k \eta \nu}$ is the ordinary phrase for bringing an action. The Scholiast says that the $\lambda a \gamma \chi a \operatorname{vec} \nu$ is due to the order of hearing having been determined by lot. Socrates here slips into the wide use of $\delta i \kappa \eta$, in which it covers $\gamma р a \phi \eta$.
$\left.a^{a} v\right]={ }^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu . \quad$ ' $\frac{1}{a} \frac{1}{a} \nu$ is simply $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i}$ ăv (with interchange of quantities),' Sonnenschein, Gk. Gr. 354* Obs. The contraction ăv is not used by .

## NOTES． 4 b Io－5 e 5

the Tragedians．But it is to be found in Thucydides and is common in Plato．
á $\mathbf{\phi}^{\prime} \eta$ Tท̂s $\delta$ ík $\eta s$ s］＇release me from the proceedings．＇
6 aưTd raûta кт入．］＇to mention in court this very challenge which I gave him．＇

 $\sigma a \theta \rho a \dot{c}$ ．Badham pointed out that $\sigma a \theta \rho$ ós $^{\text {i }}$ is connected with $\sigma \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ in the same way as $\sigma a \pi \rho \dot{s}$ with $\sigma \dot{\eta} \pi \omega$ ．The metaphor then is from a leaky vessel．
$\pi 0 \lambda v$ ．．．$\pi$ то́тєроv］With the comp．we might have had то入入へ̣̂．
4 kai é $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ тot кт入．］＇It is just as holding this opinion that I too，＇\＆c．
6 $\sigma \frac{\epsilon}{\prime} \mu \mathbf{\epsilon} v$ ］though apparently more guilty of impiety than I．
$\pi \pi_{0}$ io $\boldsymbol{\tau l}$ ］This question asks for a regular definition，consisting of genus（ $\boldsymbol{\tau} i$ ）and difference（ $\pi 0 \hat{o} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ）．
d + iS＇av ］＇Stylistic observations place the Euthyphro at the beginning of Plato＇s literary career，＇Lutoslawski，The Origin and Growth of Plato＇s Logic，p． 200 n ．It is therefore probable that we have here the first appearance of this important word in Plato．It is best rendered by＇form＇．
 preferable to the insertion of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ．But Adam takes кaтà $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{\delta} \sigma \iota o ́ \tau \eta \tau a$ in the sense of＇as the holy has＇．This is also the view of the Scholiast O who explains the words to mean $\delta \mu o i \omega s$ or $\pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma^{\prime} \omega s$

$\pi \hat{v} v$ ö $\tau \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇whenever a thing is of a nature to be unholy．＇
$8 \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ тoívov］Euthyphro，who has not yet grasped what is required of him，adduces his own conduct as an example of the holy，instead of giving a general definition．
10 t́ávtє ．．．távtc ．．．éávtc］For the triple alternative cp．
 E．N．iv． 3 § 7．Two alternatives are usual，as in Crat． 390 a ：Alc．${ }^{?}$ 149 c ăv $\tau \epsilon$ ảräà ăv $\tau \epsilon$ какá：Ant． 138 e $\notin a ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon \ldots$ ．．．$\epsilon a ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon:$
 $\tau \epsilon$ ：Laws 639 b ă $\nu \tau \epsilon \ldots$ ．．ăv $\tau \epsilon$ ．But sometimes we get four，as in Gorg． 508 d ằ $\nu \tau \epsilon \ldots$ ．．ćáv $\tau \epsilon \ldots$ ．．ćáv $\tau \epsilon \ldots$ ．．ćáv $\tau \epsilon$ ：Laws 660 e ćád te ．．．éáv te ．．．кai ćàd ．．．кaì $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ．
e $\left.2{ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \epsilon^{\prime}\right]$ Mr．Graves gives the force of this particle by translating－ ＇Why，just look．＇Lit．Since（if you doubt it）look．
3 тov̂ vópov őtเ oũtas éx $\mathbf{C l}$ ］Greek idiom for＇that the law is so＇． $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime}$ ầ ．．．む̈v］＇no matter who he may be．＇We might have
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expected $\pi a \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$, but this is generalized into $\dot{\varepsilon \sigma \tau \iota \sigma o v ̂ \nu-n o t ~ e v e n ~ i f ~ h e ~}$ be-no matter who. ence to кai á入入oss-' a thing which I have told people before For people themselves', \&c. This is quite the way in which conceited persons talk, as though it were a question between them and the whole world. This passage down to $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \lambda a \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \mathrm{c} 7$ is quoted in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica xiii. 4.
6 тuүXávovar] $\tau u \gamma \chi^{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ is used of what is as a matter of fact, without question raised as to its cause.
6 a I каіे тоขิтоv ктл.] каí=каíтоь, 'and yet.' With this passage




тòv avitov̂ $\pi a \tau \in \mathfrak{f} a]$ Cronus. The story is told in Hesiod, Theog. 453-500. If Kpóvos = xpóvos, the allegorical meaning of Cronus consuming his offspring is plain on the surface. Eusebius (Pr. Ev. xiii. 4) has here aủtòv aútov̂.

av̉ tòv aútov̂] Uranus, Hes. Theog. I33, I37.
е̇ктєцєiv] Hesiod, Theog. 180, 181.
 sense; so ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \chi$ одat is used for the pres.

$$
5
$$ Euthyphro and justifying that of the Gods.


 pleonasm. Eusebius quotes the words as ov ếveкa.
кai $\eta \mu i v$ ] ' for persons like myself.'
$3 \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \Phi i \lambda i ́ o u] \pi \rho o ́ s ~ \Phi i \lambda i ́ o v ~ o c c u r s ~ a s ~ h e r e ~ i n ~ G o r g . ~ 500 ~ b, ~ 519 ~ e, ~$

 $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \iota \sigma \tau^{\prime}$ àv $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \rho \rho \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma a \iota \mu$. As every individual had at last his $\Delta a i \mu \omega \nu$ and his $T \dot{v} \chi \eta$, so it might be gathered from the last passage (which is perhaps a proof of late origin) that every particular friendship had its presiding Zє̀̀s $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \mathrm{i}$ ios.
C $1 \quad \tau$ á $\tau \in$ ü $\lambda \lambda a$ ífpá] 'our temples in general.'
 words.
os $\pi \mathfrak{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda_{\text {los }}$ ] See a reference to this robe in Eur. Hec. $466-74$ and another in Iph. in T. 222-4. We have either a reference to, or an anticipation of, this Athenian custom in the robe presented to Athene


## NOTES. 5 e5-7a6



3 ává $\gamma \in \tau a \downarrow$ ] Quite literally, because of the ascent to the Acropolis.
9 vuvi] "just at present.' 9 e 8.
d II cíios] We had better render this by 'kind', as it gave rise to the Latin species. But no distinction is intended here between $\epsilon i \delta o s$ and $i \delta \epsilon ́ a$. The word is taken from common speech. Cp. Thuc. ii. 50

$\left.{ }^{*} \phi \eta \sigma \theta a\right] 5$ d. Euthyphro had assented to this when it was put into his mouth by Socrates.
 ( 72 c ) about the $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}[\delta 0$ of virtue.

тарабєiүцart] 'pattern.' In the Meno Socrates having defined figure and colour by way of examples says ' and you have received the patterns from me . In the Republic 592 b Socrates says of the ideal state-' Well, perhaps it is laid up in heaven as a pattern for him who wishes to look upon it, and by so doing to settle himself there'. In this dialogue the pattern is not being thought of as one for imitation, but as an original whereby to judge of the fidelity of the copy. If we know the pure form of holiness, we shall be able to judge whether a given piece of conduct is holy or not.
7 oũtw] 'in your way.' OÛTos has almost always a connexion with
 Meno 81 e.
IO $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \iota \lambda$ és ] $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \iota \lambda \eta$ 's is an equivalent for фíגos. Cp. Eur. Hec. 982-3:
 $\sigma \tau \rho a ́ \tau \epsilon \nu \mu$ ' 'A $\chi \alpha \iota \omega \nu$.
7 a 2 таүкд́入 $\omega$ s] Euthyphro has now grasped the form of a definition, but it remains to be seen whether his attempt is materially sound.
d̉ $\lambda \eta \theta \omega \bar{s}]$ sc. $\mathfrak{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho i v \omega$.
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o v$ öt ] ' of course.' The two words are sometimes written as one. They may be thrown into a sentence as here and in 9 b or may come at its close, as in Crit. 53 a : Euthd. 30 I e; Alc. ${ }^{2}{ }^{2} 49 \mathrm{~b}$ :
 à $\nu \rho \omega \pi{ }^{2} \nu \eta \mathrm{~s} \delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ öтı. With the sentence as a whole cp. Prot. 328 e
 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \delta \in\{a \xi \in$.

టs] 'that', not 'how', which would be ömws or $\pi \hat{\omega}$.
$6 \tau_{i}^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \gamma \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbf{v}$ ] The attempted definition being regarded as the joint concern of Euthyphro and Socrates.

тò $\mu$ ย̀v $\theta \in о ф \iota \lambda$ és кт入.] 'the thing or a person whom the Gods love.' The person comes in as an afterthought. It occurs to Socrates as he speaks that the thing may be a person.
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b I єip $\begin{aligned} & \text { ral } \\ & \text { yáp] }\end{aligned}$ The fact of its having been said by himself is a presumption in Euthyphro's mind of its having been said well. These words are wanted in the text as каì тоѝто eĭpŋтаı refers back to them.
 verbs.
6 Tiv $\omega v$ ] The introduction of a question by an oblique case is a thing to which English does not lend itself. We have to bring the question to the front-' What are the things, my good sir, difference about which causes enmity and bad passions?' These questions, which are brought in as it were by a side-wind, are often very difficult to translate, e.g. below $7 \mathrm{c} 10,13 \mathrm{~d}$ : Rep. $33^{2} \mathrm{c}$ 市 rioiv

8 óто́тєpa $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{i} \omega$ ] The pl. is quite logical, the comparison being really between two sets of things.
 meant to prepare us for this. Cp. Apol. 40 d , where there is

 $\dot{\gamma} \in \nu_{\epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a l}$ : Tim. 29 e.
IO ' $\pi i$ i $\lambda 0 \gamma เ \sigma \mu$ ov ] 'to reckoning,' i.e. we should appeal from sense to reason.
 Cp. below $\delta \iota a \kappa p i \theta \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$. . . єi $\boldsymbol{\mu} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}$, Phlb. 44 d 及ov $\lambda \theta \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$, Parm. 127 a $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu, 149 \mathrm{c}$, and Phlb. $24 \mathrm{~d} \epsilon i \not \tau \eta \nu$. So in Alc. ${ }^{1} 128 \mathrm{e}$ $\gamma \nu o i ̂ \mu \in \nu$.
 $\sigma \tau a \theta \mu \hat{\varphi}$ סı'́ $\tau a \xi a s, 2$ Esdras iv. 36,37 'For he hath weighed the world in the balance; and by measure hath he measured the times, and by number hath he numbered the seasons'.

 ítávaı é $\lambda \theta$ óvtes. If so, this second question ought to be about some moral criterion corresponding to the physical criteria of number, measure, and weight. This question, however, is not gone
 in d 2,3 . For want of a competent decision men dispute in moral matters. According to Plato all acts of selfishness and injustice spring merely from an erroneous opinion about right.
$12 \pi \rho o ́ x \in!\rho o v]$ Cp. Apol. 23 d.

$\eta \rho o ́ \mu \eta v$. . . ท̀ $\rho \omega \dot{\tau} \omega v$ ] It is not mere love of variety that prompts


## NOTES. $7 \mathrm{~b}_{1-9} \mathrm{a}_{2}$

as an imperf. Now the aor. indicative of é $\rho \omega \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\alpha} \nu$ does not seem to be employed by Plato.
11 тov̂tó $\boldsymbol{\gamma} €$. . . ©] $]$ Like id quod in Latin, 'a thing which.'
raúróv] 'at the same time.'
b. Kpóvø] The sentiments of Cronus ought to have been divided on this subject. His father suffered at his hands as he at the hands of his son.
 to the same legend as here. It is recounted by Pausanias (i. 20 § 2). Hera had flung away Hephaestus at his birth. Bearing a grudge against her for this, he sent her a present of a golden throne set with invisible chains, whereby, when she sat on it, she got bound. Hephaestus was deaf to the persuasions of the other Gods, but Dionysus, whom he trusted most, made him drunk and brought him to Olympus. There, we are left to infer, he was induced to release his mother. In Iliad xviii. $395-405$ it is Hera herself who throws Hephaestus out of heaven in disgust at his lameness, not Zeus for defending her, as in Iliad i. 586-94.
8 ஸ́s oú $\delta \in \mathfrak{i}$ ] Greek idiom requires a negative here, where the English does not. $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ is treated as a verb of saying, and is followed by a statement of what is actually said. See Sonnenschein, Gk. Gr. 368 b Obs. Cp. c i, 2 ả $\mu \phi \iota \beta \beta \eta$ тoûvtos $\dot{\omega}$. . . oủ $\delta \in i ̂$ ííк $\eta \nu$ סıס́óvar, c. 10, d i, \&c.
C 5 фtúyovtes] 'in their efforts to escape.'
d 8 oúkov̂v. . . $\pi \epsilon \pi$ óv $\theta a \sigma$ เv] 'Then are not the Gods also in just the same case?'
e 2 tov̂to $\mu_{\hat{\prime} v}^{\prime}$ ] We had an instance of $\mu^{\prime} \nu$ without $\delta_{\epsilon}^{\prime}$ before in 3 c 6 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a ̀$ тò $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ катаүє $\lambda a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$. This use is specially common with то仑ेтo, the $\mu^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ serving merely to throw a stress upon the pronoun'This statement of yours is true (whatever may be thought of others).' Cp. Crat. 436 c : Phlb. 49 d : Alc. ${ }^{1}$ IO4 a, I22 d: Alc. ${ }^{2} 143$ b; Hipp. 226 e : Euthd. $278 \mathrm{e}, 300 \mathrm{~b}$, 301 c : Rep. 404 c : Laws $628 \mathrm{a}, 686 \mathrm{c}$, 788 c . In all the above $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu$ occurs without $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ following. In Euthd. 288 a we have ovitos $\mu \grave{e} \nu$ ó $\lambda^{\prime}$ ó $o s$, and in Apol. 21 d toútov $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$
 See Meno 82 b note.
4 ÉKaqтov] It is always the minor premiss of the syllogism which is in dispute, not 'Should injustice be punished?' but 'Is this act unjust?'
6 єїтєр ả $\mu \phi \stackrel{\sigma \beta \eta r o v ̂ \sigma เ v ~}{\theta \in o i ́] ~ S o c r a t e s ~ a l w a y s ~ g u a r d s ~ h i m s e l f ~ a g a i n s t ~}$ admitting this, except for the sake of argument.
 proof, as opposed to a mere $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \nu$ or probable indication. Arist.

## EUTHYPHRO

 Eivau.

## 5

 is sometimes used for 'chains', as in Tim. 73 b : Pausanias i. 20 § 2, but, acc. to Rutherford, 'no Attic writer every employed $\delta \in \sigma \mu \alpha$ for

кai $\mathbf{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Still governed by the wis in a 2.

 symptom of suppressed indignation on the part of Socrates.
b I $\pi$ avtòs $\mu \mathrm{a} \lambda \lambda \mathrm{\lambda ov}]$ ' more than anything,' i.e. 'above everything'. Common in Plato. Cp. Phaedo 67 b, 72 d, 87 c : Crat. 394 e : Phdr. 228 d, 236 c: Alc. ${ }^{1} 124$ b: Euthd. 290 b: Hipp. Ma. 295 e, 304 a : Rep. $518 \mathrm{e}, 520 \mathrm{e}, 595 \mathrm{a}$ : Laws 630 c . The superlative of this expression, which, however, comes to much the same thing as itself, is $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \nu \mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda_{1} \sigma \tau \alpha$, which we bave in I 5 b 3 . The change of number is quite logical, since the comparative is dual, and compares only with one thing, while the superlative is plural, comparing with many things.
 bestowed upon a good quality, while $\epsilon \gamma \kappa \omega ́ \mu ı a$ are reserved for


5 '̇ँ $\pi \in i]$ 'though.' Difficult indeed, but by no means impossible, since, \&rc. See 4 cn., 5 en.
\%ัтt] See note on 3 b 5 .
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ov őтl] 7 a 4 note.
öt $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda เ \sigma \tau a]$ quam naxime.
d
$\eta \dagger \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \theta \omega v$ ] Hermann's text has $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} i \sigma \theta \omega \sigma a \nu$, but this form is now regarded as post-classical.
á $\lambda \lambda$ ' åpa тоข̂то $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'But as for this correction which we are now making in the definition.' So far the holy has been 'what is loved by the Gods', now it is to be 'what is loved by all the Gods '. oúŚ́єєєрa ที ả áфóтєрa] In strict logic only 'neither'. In the case of ov́ $\delta \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \rho a$ and $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \rho a$ and the like expressions, the preference for

 by itself see Polit. 258 a : Phlb. 43 c : Phdr. 228 a : Anter. 133 d : Lys. 218 e: Hipp. Ma. 294 a. For $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \rho a$ see Parm. 165 d : Phlb.

 Rep. 499 c : Laws 655 d.

## NOTES. 9 a 2-II a 7

e 7 oкєாréov] On the intellectual duty of inquiry cp. Phaedo $85 \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{d}$ : Meno 8ic, e.
0 a 5 A'үouív $\pi i$ ] 'Do we use the terms brought and bringing?' The dialectic of Socrates started from current notions and endeavoured to attain truth by correcting them. Hence the frequency of this and the like formulas in the Platonic dialogues. Cp. Rep. $477{ }^{\text {b }} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ' $\gamma$ o $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v} v$
 $3^{8} 5 \mathrm{~b}, 4^{21} \mathrm{a}$ : Alc. ${ }^{1} 128$ a: Gorg. 454 c : Rep. 608 d калєis $\tau t$; Hipp.
 סıбaбкá入ous; See further Meno 75 d note.
 in any way.' The former $\tau_{c}$ seems to be subject and the latter $\operatorname{cogn}$. acc.
 for any passive verb. The particular interpretation which we require

10 vimò $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{v}]=\dot{v} \pi \grave{̀}$ roúrav $\dot{v} \phi^{\prime} \tilde{\omega} \nu$. But in Greek a preposition is regularly omitted with the relative when it has been previously employed with the antecedent (Apol. 27 d, note), so that we should have $\dot{U} \pi \grave{c}$ rovirav $\dot{\sim} \nu$, which is here reduced to $\dot{u} \pi o ̀ ~ \tilde{\omega} \nu$. For the hiatus, cp. Meno 77 a karà ődov. Cicero (Orator, § 151 ) mentions the frequent appearance of hiatus in Plato, not only in the Dialogues, where it might be considered intentional, but even in such a display of rhetoric as the Menexenus-' in ea est crebra ista vocalium concursic, quam magna ex parte ut vitiosam fugit Demosthenes.'
$\left.\mathrm{d}_{2} \quad \AA \lambda \lambda_{0} \tau \iota\right]$ The interrogative formula ä̀ $\lambda \lambda_{0} \tau \iota \eta{ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime}(=$ Lat. nonne) is an indirect way of indicating the affirmative by ezcluding the negative, like the Irishman's proof of an alibi-' Will you swear that this man was there that night?' 'Yes'. 'How do you know?' 'Why where else would he be?' On ẳ $\lambda \lambda_{0} \tau_{\iota} \eta{ }_{\eta}$, see Crito 50 a n . When the phrase became stereotyped, the $\eta^{\eta}$ was often omitted. Cp. Theaet. 165 e: Parm. 143 b, 158 b: Symp. 200 d , e, $201 \mathrm{a}:$ Alc. ${ }^{1} 114 \mathrm{c}$ : Hipp. 226 e: Charm. 173 a, b: Euthd. 276 a, 283 d, 284 b, 287 a, 298 a, 299 b: Hipp. Ma. 287 d, e, 296 b: Meno 82c, 97 a: Rep. 337 c: Laws 660 e.
 3 II b: Gorg. 45 I c, and see Meno 74 b note.
I a 7 ovoiav... $\begin{gathered}\text { ádos] Here we have the first appearance of the }\end{gathered}$ famous contrast between 'essence' and 'accident'. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \theta 0$; was
 $\sigma v \mu \beta \in \beta \eta$ rít $\omega \nu \quad \tau$. How the transition of phrase might be effected
 népoàs.

## EUTHYPHRO

 accident'.


7 Tєрiє́pXєTal] ' moves about,' not 'goes round', which is expressed

 a sculptor, but, according to the Scholiast, he was induced by Archelaus the philosopher to abandon his art. As all doctors were supposed to be descended from Asclepius, so all sculptors, it would seem, claimed descent from Daedalus. Cp. Alc. ${ }^{1} 121$ a. Daedalus is spoken of in Ion 533 a as the son of Metion, but his ultimate descent was from Hephaestus, and so from Zeus. His name is proverbial for curious and beautiful works (Rep. $5^{29}$ d). In Laws 677 d he is vaguely spoken of as having existed some thousand or two thousand years before the supposed date of the dialogue. The Scholiast explains that it was the lifelike character of his works which gave rise to the idea that they walked about. He was the first to make a statue with the legs apart ( $\pi \in \rho / \sigma \kappa \in \lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon^{\prime}$ ).
 it doubtless contains a further reference to putting a statue in position.

 indicating something to be supplied. 'But as it is (not so), for.' Shilleto however in his note on Thuc. i. $25 \S 4$, maintained that the original meaning of $\gamma$ áp was 'truly', 'verily', and that in such passages as the present there is no ellipse. If so, we should translate-' But as it is the assumptions are really yours.' Cp. Apol. 38 b note: Symp. 18 oc : Lach. 200 e.
$\boldsymbol{\sigma X}$ ESóv ri] Cp. Theaet. 143 a : Hipp. Ma. $282 \mathrm{e}, 288 \mathrm{c}, 295 \mathrm{~d}$ : Ion $534 \mathrm{~d}, 540 \mathrm{~b}$. The use of $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta_{o ́ v}$ in place of $\sigma \chi \in \delta^{\circ} \nu \quad \tau_{\iota}$ has been noted as one of the marks of Plato's later style. It is to be found in Ion $53^{2}$ b: Clit. $408 \mathrm{c}, 410 \mathrm{e}$, among other places, and in innumerable passages in the Laws.
d 7 ák $\omega v$ єípi $\sigma 0 \phi o ́ s$ ] ' I am an artist in spite of myself.'
Tavzádou Xp $\eta \mu a \tau a]$ Tantalus is mentioned in Crat. 395 d , e : Prot. $3{ }^{1} 5 \mathrm{c}$ : Gorg. $5^{2} 5 \mathrm{e}$, but this is the only allusion to his wealth. Cp. Meno go a тà Пoдukpátous रрŋ́ $\mu a \tau a$.


 $\tau \rho u \phi \hat{a} \nu$ is used of the behaviour of any one who is spoilt by luxury or indulgence. Lach. $179 \mathrm{c}:$ Meno 76 b .

## NOTES. II a $9-12$ c $_{4}$

3 $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \rho o \theta \nu \mu \eta \sigma \sigma \mu a l]$ In Plato the word occurs here and in Lach. 200 d, e.
4 троатока́ ${ }^{2}$ ] ] Only here in Plato.
ei oúk] Here we might certainly havc expected $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$. See note on Crito 46 c \#ै oṽ.
12 a 6 oúvretve oavróv] Like our 'pull yourself together', but the metaphor is probably from stringing a lyre.
 preceding. Socrates' contradiction of the poet is a fresh point intended to illustrate his question.
of roinris] According to the Scholiast RS these lines are from the Cypria of Stasinus. The earliest instance of Homeric criticism which we possess is where Herodotus (ii. II7) proves that this poem could not have been by Homer.
[ $\left.\theta^{\prime}\right]$ The dental, being followed by a vowel with the soft breathing, does not require to be aspirated. The aspiration seems to stand for the lost digamma.
ròv épgavia] It seems safer to translate this 'the doer' than (with Adam) to suppose that the doctrine of creation was propounded so early as the Cypria. With the Greeks Zeus was from the first the father of Gods and men. But even in the Timaeus God is not in a strict sense a creator, but only an artificer ( $\delta \eta \mu$ covprós), who shapes the world out of pre-existent material.

غ́ $\oint$ v́тєvสєข] In Iliad xv. 134 :
aủ $\frac{1}{\rho} \rho$ тoîs ắ $\lambda \lambda о \iota \sigma \iota ~ \kappa а \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ ф v \tau \epsilon v ̂ \sigma \alpha \iota, ~$
and in several passages of the Odyssey фutєv́єır means merely 'to cause', 'to bring about'. That may be the meaning here, not 'to beget', but apart from the context it is impossible to decide.
b 2 єiँ $\pi \omega$ ] Deliberative conjunctive. 'Am I to tell you?' = 'Shall I tell you?' Cp. oúra $\phi \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$; in d 3 : Crito $48 \mathrm{~d}, 49 \mathrm{~d}$.
5 kai vó $\sigma$ ous kai tevías] Arist. E. N. iii. 6 § 3 фоßov́ $\mu \in \theta a \mu$ èv
 Plato is much addicted to a rhetorical employment of the plural of abstract terms. See Crito 46 c note. For the plural of $\pi \in v_{i} a^{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{cp}$.

 523c: Rep. 495a, 6I9a.
10 $\pi \in \phi \dot{\prime} \beta \eta$ rat $]$ For the pf. pass. thus used of a state of fear, like


 387 b: Epp. 349 a.
C 4 íva $\mu$ èv... oủ $\mu$ '́vтol] Among the substitutes for $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ after $\mu_{\epsilon ́ v}$

## EUTHYPHRO

one that is fairly frequent is $\mu^{\prime}$ viol. See Apol. $3^{8}$ d note. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}$


 $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu . .$. какíà $\mu$ ívtot . . . eivau.

6 uóplov үáp $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] This seems better taken as a statement than as a question. Fearing to be dogmatic, Socrates immediately turns it into a question in ov́r $\omega \phi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \iota o \nu$ is a part in extension, which Cicero renders by pars.

тò $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau 0 v ิ \tau o$ ] 'the next step.' Often thus used of the logical consequence to which an induction or some train of reasoning has been leading up. See Crito 47 e note. Cp. Alc. ${ }^{2} 144$ d, Laws 641 d тò $\mu \in \tau \grave{a}$ тov̂ro, 644 d , Clit. 408 c тò $\mu \in \tau \grave{a}$ rav̂тa: Phaedo, $100 \mathrm{c} \tau \grave{a}$



тò $\pi$ oiov $\mu$ f́pos] i. e. we must ascertain the differentia of the species 'holy' as compared with the genus 'just'. To prefix the article to an interrogative does not in any way alter the meaning. It is merely a more precise way of speaking. Cp. e I. Aesch. P. V.

7 Tติv vuvסท́] c 6.
 arose out of geometry, and they bear to this day the marks of their origin, when we speak of 'square' and 'cube' numbers. An even number was called 'isosceles' as being divisible into two equal parts, and an odd number was called 'scalene'. Similarly, a number which had two equal factors was called 'square' (тєтрáyovos, iбóm $\lambda \epsilon \cup \rho о s, ~ i \sigma о \mu \eta ́ \kappa \eta$ s, Theaet. 147 e : Rep. 546 c ), while a number like $6(=3 \times 2)$ was called 'oblong' ( $\pi \rho \rho \mu \eta$ ' $\kappa \eta s$ ).



4 фapєv] This word should not be translated. It is often used superfluously with $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ or some other verb of saying or asking, being generally thrown in parenthetically, e. g. Symp. $190 \mathrm{c} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon t$




 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$. The usage is not confined to Plato. Cp. Hdt. v. $50 \lambda \in \in \gamma \epsilon 1$. . . фás, Arist. E. E. i. 5 § 7 ảтокрivaбөal . . . фávaı.

## NOTES. $\quad 12 \mathrm{c}_{4}-14 \mathrm{~d}_{4}$

b 2 ßoŋ入atเкท́] Used by Plato only here and in c I.
 have answered this question, he would indeed have thrown light upon religion. Man, we are often told to-day, is a fellow-worker with God. Yes, but in the production of what effect? 'Of many fine ones,' is still the only answer. Each man has to judge for himself what is that fine effect towards the achievement of which it is his mission to co-operate.
a to 'pyacias] 'business,' a wider term than $\boldsymbol{a}^{\pi} \pi \rho$ paocia, 'production.'
b 9 à $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \quad \gamma a ́ \rho]$ ' but indeed' or 'but the fact is' generally gives the force of these particles. See Apol. 19 c note. Cp. 6d 6, 9c 2 : Symp. 199 a: Phdr. 228 a: Alc ${ }^{1} 124$ b: Euthd. 305 a: Meno 92 c, 94 d, e : Hipp. Ma. 291 e, $295^{\circ} \mathrm{c}, 300 \mathrm{c}, 30 \mathrm{I}$ b: Ion 54 I e : Laws 636 a, 655 a.
C I $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \mathrm{os} \epsilon i]$ sc. ov̉ $\pi \rho \dot{\rho} \theta v \mu \mathrm{os} \ddot{\omega} \nu$.
' $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ ' av่ $\boldsymbol{1} \hat{\omega}]$ ' just on the point.'
3

 є $\omega \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \eta, 329$ b è $\pi \epsilon \pi \check{\prime} \nu \theta \eta$.
vôv $\delta^{\prime}$. ... óvtót $\left.\eta \tau a\right]$ The punctuation in this passage is perplexing. There seem to be three ways of taking the words, with none of which it suits-
(1) 'But now-as the suitor must needs follow the sued wherever the latter leads-what is it again which you say that the holy and holiness are ?' In this case the $\delta \dot{\eta}$ gives a tone of impatience to the question.
(2) 'But now (not so), for the suitor must needs follow the sued wherever the latter leads. What then do you say again that the holy and holiness are?' The sense is against this rendering, as $\gamma^{\prime} \rho$ ought to give a reason for the suppressed clause, which it does not.
(3) 'But now it is necessary indeed for the suitor to follow the sued wherever the latter leads. What then do you say again that the holy and holiness are?'
 14 b 2-4. This definition, which falls in with the Platonic equation of virtue with knowledge, was taken up by the Stoics. Diog.
 In substance it comes from Socrates, Xen. Mem. iv. 6 § 4 ó ăpa



$\mathrm{d}_{+}$



## EUTHYPHRO. NOTFS. $14 \mathrm{~d}_{4}-16 \mathrm{a}_{3}$

technical term in moral philosophy émitupia was afterwards restricted by Aristotle to the desire for pleasure.
d 5 Xapai $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i t a l]$ Mr. Graves quotes 1 Sam. iii. 19 'and the Lord was with him, and did let none of his words fall to the ground'. It appears from the Scholiast RS that the saying was proverbial. same persons cp . line 10 and 15 a 4. In each case a stress is added by the change from the personal to the demonstrative pronoun.

 which appear more arbitrary will be found in Eur. Med. 1046, 1296 ; Hipp. 195.

 plain to every one.'
 St. James i. J 7 .
$\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta}]$ When Aristotle is proving that honour is the highest of external goods, the first reason which he adduces is that it is the only good which we assign to the Gods (E. N. iv. 3 § 10).
Io äptı] With reference to $k \epsilon \chi a \rho \iota \sigma \mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \nu \nu$ in 14 b 1 .
b I $\kappa \in X a p l \sigma \mu$ évov] There is a subtle ambiguity about this word. The argument requires it to mean ' the outcome of gratitude on our part', whereas Euthyphro takes it to mean 'grateful to the Gods', which comes to much the same thing as 'dear' to them, so that to distinguish the two seems to him a useless refinement.



$\mathrm{d}_{3}$ © $\Pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon \mathrm{v}$ ] P Proteus ille. The 'unerring old man of the sea' had to be tightly grasped, else he would elude one in some evasive form, instead of staying to reveal the truth. See Hom. Od. iv. 384-570; Verg. Georg. iv. 387-452.
5. oủk $\epsilon \sigma \tau เ \nu$ ö $\pi \omega$ s] 'it is impossible that.'

6 סtwká $\theta$ єv] This form is used by Plato also in Gorg. 483 a , Rep. 375 a . It does not differ in meaning from $\delta_{\iota \omega} \dot{\kappa} \epsilon \iota \nu$. Cp .

 the Gods (too much) to expose yourself to the risk.'
 vividness we should have had $\dot{a} \pi a \lambda \lambda a \xi{ }^{\prime} \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ before. It is possible,
 promise that Socrates would amend his evil ways.
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[^0]:    
     ' he who honours the Gods,' but had been induced to admit that 'there are laws in accordance with which one ought to do this.'

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ On the tetralogies, see Meno, Introd. pp. 10, 13, 14.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Lutoslawski, pp. 102, 103, 200 n.

[^3]:    a $3 \gamma \in \mathrm{~B}$ ：om．T
    
    plato，vol．i．
    a 5 డ̄ Eù $\dot{v} \dot{\phi} \phi \omega_{\nu}$ constanter B T，plerumque
    

[^4]:    
    
    

[^5]:    
     a $3 \gamma \epsilon$ $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \mathrm{B}$ T: $\gamma \in \kappa \operatorname{c} \boldsymbol{l} \delta \in \imath ̂ \mathrm{~W}$

[^6]:    
    
     $\chi \rho \eta \mathrm{B}^{2} \mathrm{TW}$

[^7]:    
    
    
    
    
    

[^8]:     sed a supra versum）：$\delta i^{\prime}$ \＆̂．B Eusebius b $\quad$ кai aùroì T Arm．：
    
    
    
    

[^9]:    eg фr！́s B T ：є̌фทs W a $4_{\tau \epsilon} \mathrm{W}$ ：om．B T
    
    a in $\delta] \dot{\psi}$ al． b 7 тuítov B T：$\tau$ oút $\omega \nu \mathrm{T}^{2} \mathrm{~W}$

[^10]:    
    
    
    
    

[^11]:    
    
    a 9 фı入єîtal T
    
    

[^12]:    c 7 supra $\delta \notin$ add. $\gamma \in \mathrm{B}^{2} \quad \mathrm{c} 8 \tau \alpha ̀ \mathrm{~B}^{2} \mathrm{~T} \mathrm{~W}: \tau \alpha \dot{\delta} \epsilon \mathrm{B}$ aủtoîs TW :
    
    

[^13]:    $\mathrm{d}_{5}$ ท̆ $\nu \pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{TW}: \hat{\eta} \pi \in \rho \mathrm{B}$
    d $9 \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u} \nu$
    
    TW：om．B

[^14]:    
     тотє in marg．T d $9 \gamma \in \mathrm{~T}$ ：om．B Arm．（lacunam indicat W） e9 тvүхávєı B T：$\tau \nu \gamma \chi \alpha ́ v o \iota ~ W ~$

[^15]:    
    
     B
    $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ aủ B ：oườ T c $8 \delta \mu \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ бой $\mu \epsilon \nu$ pr．B T

